

Reply to Office Action dated September 15, 2005

### REMARKS

Claims 1-17, 19-20, 22-24 and 26-34 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 6-9, 11-14, 16, 19-20, 22, 26, 27, 29 and 31-32 are amended, and claims 18, 21 and 25 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Various amendments are made to the claims for clarity and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent 6,741,953 to Hernandez et al. (hereafter Hernandez). The Office Action also rejects claims 1, 2, 3, 8, 10-13 and 18 under 37 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent 6,411,242 to Oprescu et al. (hereafter Oprescu). Still further, the Office Action rejects claims 20-22, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30-32 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent 6,675,071 to Griffin Jr., et al. (hereafter Griffin). Additionally, the Office Action rejects claims 23 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Griffin in view of Oprescu. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Office Action's indication that claims 6, 7, 9, 16, 17, 19, 26 and 29 contain allowable subject matter. By this Amendment, independent claim 1 is amended to include allowable features of dependent claim 6 and dependent claim 9 is rewritten in independent form. Furthermore, dependent claim 19 is rewritten in independent form and dependent claim 29 is rewritten in independent form. Additionally, independent claim 31 is amended to include allowable features similar to dependent claim 16.

Independent claim 11 recites the processing circuit including a filtering circuit coupled in a plurality of stages, each of the stages to provide a separate response. Independent claim 11 also recites the processing circuit to output a processed signal based on the separate response.

Reply to Office Action dated September 15, 2005

Oprescu, Hernandez and Griffin do not teach or suggest all these features. That is, the applied references do not suggest a filtering circuit coupled in a plurality of stages where each of the stages provides a separate response. Thus, independent claim 11 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 20 defines patentable subject matter for at least similar reasons. That is, independent claim 20 recites modifying a channel response of the received signal by performing a filtering operation on the received signal, the filtering operation including dividing the received signal into a plurality of stages, each stage providing a separate response. The applied references do not teach or suggest these features. Thus, independent claim 20 defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason.

It is respectfully submitted that each of the independent claims 1, 9, 11, 19, 20, 29 and 31 define patentable subject matter. That is, Hernandez, Oprescu and Griffin do not teach or suggest features of each of the independent claims. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-17, 19-20, 22-24 and 26-34 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place

Serial No. **10/743,349**


Docket No. **INTEL-0064**

Reply to Office Action dated September 15, 2005

the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



David C. Oren  
Registration No. 38,694  
Attorney for Intel Corporation

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
(703) 766-3701 DYK:DCO/kah

**Date: December 14, 2005**

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer No. 34610**